

**Docket No. 020075****Serial No. 10/010,587****REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office action dated April 20, 2005 has been carefully considered. Claims 1-25 are active in this application. Further examination and reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-25 is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is submitted as having been overcome in view of the amendments to claims 11-18 substituting "service hub" for "system," consistent with the language of independent claim 10.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Marshall et al. (US 200100316565 A1) is respectfully traversed. However, in order to further define applicants invention, independent claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended to recite operational messages comprising macro messages (claims 1 and 10) or an operational message comprising a macro message. Marshall fails to teach or suggest the use of macro messages in this reference concerning systems and methods for interactive wagering. It was alleged at page 4, first full paragraph of the Office action that Marshall discloses macro messages at paragraphs 0053-0054 and 0059 and 0062. However, neither these paragraphs, nor any other paragraph, drawing, etc. in Marshall teach or suggest macro messages. For instance, paragraph 0053-0054 state "any suitable mechanism for transmitting data." Despite such contemplations, there are no revelations of macro messages in Marshall. It is believed that these paragraphs and the meaning of macro messages have been misapprehended. Macro codes or messages (referenced as macros) are well-known "templates" used in data communications for reducing the amount of data transmitted over the air. Macros generally operate by transmitting a macro identifier and fields of information supplied by a vehicle operator or automatically by a computer onboard a vehicle or the like. When communicating such a macro, only the macro number and fields are transmitted. As all of the claims now in this case include the above limitation, either explicitly or through dependency on a claim that recites the macro message limitation, it is respectfully submitted that all claims now are patentably distinct from Marshall.

Claims 2 and 11 have been amended to provide that the macro messages need not have the same meaning among service providers. Specifically, with reference to claim 11, the

Docket No. 020075

Serial No. 10/010,587

macros messages are "defined according to the one or more service providers, each macro message being capable of different meanings among the one or more service providers. These limitations further distinguish claims 2 and 11 from Marshall.

The rejection of claims 5 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. in view of Kaplan et al. is respectfully traversed. As it is clear that Marshall fails to teach a macro message, Kaplan likewise fails to teach, suggest or make obvious in any combination with Marshall, a macro message. Consequently, it is submitted that Marshall et al. in view of Kaplan et al. fails to teach, suggest or make obvious claims 5 and 14.

In view of the amendment and remarks, this application is submitted as being in a condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully requested. Applicants therefore respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 22, 2005By: 

Richard A. Bachand  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 25,107

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-2779  
Telephone: (858) 845-8503  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502